Message

From: Lindstrom, Andrew [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=04BF7CF26AA44CE29763FBC1C1B2338E-LINDSTROM, ANDREW]

Sent: 8/25/2016 7:16:26 PM

To: Oshima, Kevin [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=99dd58bd58f546b69ac08df6ec0667a0-Oshima, Kevin]; Biales, Adam

[/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=db4c5362720344acbe5db220fbe410f2-Biales, Adam]

CC: Buckley, Timothy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=197a3461d9824a17850f34cc2b0b37fe-Buckley, Timothy]; Strynar, Mark

[/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=5a9910d5b38e471497bd875fd329a20a-Strynar, Mark]

Subject: RE: ORD363 review

Kevin.

Thank you very much for your quick review on this.

I'll take a look and let you know if we have any questions.

Thank you,

Andy

From: Oshima, Kevin

Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 3:00 PM

To: Biales, Adam <Biales.Adam@epa.gov>; Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>

Cc: Buckley, Timothy < Buckley. Timothy@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ORD363 review

Andy,

Here are my comments. Let me know if you have questions. It may be helpful for us to talk.

Kevin

From: Biales, Adam

Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 10:15 AM

To: Lindstrom, Andrew < Lindstrom. Andrew@epa.gov >

Cc: Buckley, Timothy < Buckley, Timothy@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew < Gillespie, Andrew@epa.gov>; Oshima, Kevin

<<u>Oshima.Kevin@epa.gov</u>> **Subject:** RE: ORD363 review

Hey Andy,

Just finished reviewing the manuscript. Looks pretty good. I made comments directly on the manuscript. Two points are worth pointing out. First, you will need to make sure that there is a disclaimer. Second, I think you are going to need more details on when, where and how the samples were actually taken. Given the implications of this paper, I think it prudent to be as specific as you can be about the sampling. There is very little information about how the water samples were collected, replication or location relative to the communities and the DWTPs. Figure S2 is generally useful for understanding the very general layout of the watershed and the relative position of communities and the production plant, it is not particularly useful in relating your sampling to these features in the watershed. Also, not sure if it is intentional, but the DWTPs were not indicated on the map.

Also, just a question, did you see any seasonal variability in concentration between low and high flow. Might be interesting to look at that since I am guessing that the sources for Communities A and B are different than C (downstream of the plant) and would maybe be expected to be more affected by rain events and runoff. Seems like the constancy of input from the plant might be another way to link surface water concentrations to the source.

Just an FYI about the process. We (Kevin, Tim and I) will get you comments by Monday. Once they have been addressed, we will send it to OW and put it into STICS. It will work its way through STICS through JOZ and finally to Bob Kaylock.

Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Adam Biales, Ph.D.
Chief, Internal Exposure Indicators Branch (IEIB)
National Exposure Research Laboratory
Office of Research and Development
United States Environmental Protection Agency
26 W. Martin Luther King Dr.
Mail Stop 591

Cincinnati, OH 45268 Office: 513-569-7094

Personal Phone / Ex. 6

From: Lindstrom, Andrew

Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 10:18 AM **To:** Biales, Adam < Biales. Adam@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: ORD363 review

Adam,

Do we need two internal reviews to get this paper cleared?

This is another paper with lead author and senior authors from academia who are motivated to get this published as quickly as possible.

And the paper has some pretty big implications. We're showing that conventional drinking water treatment processes do not remove the new ether- containing PFAS replacements that were made necessary by the Stewardship Process.

I'm hoping that our internal review process will move more quickly this time.

Thank you,

Andy

From: Lindstrom, Andrew

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:24 AM **To:** Starr, James < Starr, James@epa.gov>

Cc: Mark Strynar <<u>Strynar.Mark@epa.gov</u>>; Biales, Adam <<u>Biales.Adam@epa.gov</u>>; Medina-Vera, Myriam <<u>Medina-</u>

Vera.Myriam@epa.gov> Subject: ORD363 review

Jim,

Thank you for agreeing to review our draft manuscript entitled "Traditional and emerging perfluoroalkyl substances in the Cape Fear River Watershed, North Carolina: Occurrence and fate during conventional and advanced water treatment

processes" by Mei Sun, Elisa Arevalo, Mark Strynar, Andrew Lindstrom, and Detlef Knappe. This is an invited manuscript for *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*.

Our coauthors are from the environmental engineering department at NCSU and this work is part of our long-time collaboration with them investigating local sources of PFAS and potential treatment technologies.

I have attached a copy of the draft manuscript and the supporting information along with the ORD363 from needed for your review. We appreciate your willingness to review this material prior to its submission.

If you have any questions please let us know.

Thank you very much,

Andy